

## PROCEDURE

A standard letter was sent out to the prospective interviewee explaining the purpose of the study and asking for about forty-five minutes of their time to participate in a telephone interview. If they accepted, an appointment time and date were set, and they were sent a set of key questions that would be used in the interview so that they would have a chance to reflect on their answers in advance and not have to respond in the spur of the moment. A list of these questions are in Table 2. Of the forty-five interviewees, we were turned down by one and four others did not respond to our inquiries. Sometimes a political figure was immersed in the current legislative session, another time a person was leaving her position to go to another state. No one refused participation because of a stated concern about the project or its outcome.

Each interview was tape recorded, except in two instances when the interviewee specifically requested that notes be taken instead. The taped interviews were transcribed and the scripts were used for further analysis. In the two interviews not taped, the notes were reviewed in similar fashion.

## METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Each of the interview scripts was read by three judges who underlined passages in different colors that represented the categories of **facilitators** and **barriers**. Facilitator passages were those that enhanced the enactment and development of an educational program for four-year-olds. The initiatives of legislation, the work of advocates, or the development of a personnel preparation program would all fall under the general area of facilitation. Examples of barriers would be opposition by various groups, lack of needed resources, and lack of needed infrastructure.

A category system for coding the interview material was developed from an earlier system

derived for explaining barriers to policy initiation or support (Haskins & Gallagher, 1981; Gallagher & Clifford, 2000). To the original categories of **institutional**, **psychological (individual)**, **sociological (groups)**, **economic**, **political**, and **geographic**, three other categories were added. These were **academic evidence** (data presented either for or against the policy), **media** (evidence or opinions in the popular media which supported or opposed the policy), and **resources** (the availability or unavailability of personnel, facilities, and so on). These were added based on our background knowledge of this particular issue.

The facilitators for each of these nine categories were considered to be the opposite or mirror image of the barriers. A facilitator under economics, for example, was the availability of funds to carry out the policy. A barrier under this economics category would be the unavailability of such funds, or unwillingness to spend such funds. Brief descriptions of the coding statements for facilitators are presented in Table 3. Sample responses coded under each category are provided in Table 3.

On occasion, a statement seemed to overlap the facilitator categories such as “The governor was extremely instrumental in getting the legislature to pass the bill”. Such a statement would be coded (B) for the governor as an Individual and (E) for Political to represent the political process of passing the bill. Each statement was coded according to all applicable categories.

Table 4 shows the categories that represent the barriers coded for the study. Sample responses are given as examples for each of the coding. Barriers were those forces that were perceived by the interviewees to be standing in the path, or continued to stand in the path of the prekindergarten program. Lack of funds, political opposition, inability to collaborate, and inadequate space all represent common barriers. As was true with the